Unconscious Cerebration in History.

AN ADDRESS

READ BEFORE THE

Kansas Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

BY

GUSTAVUS FRANKLIN KIMBALL,

AT THE STATE HOUSE, TOPEKA, KANSAS, APRIL 19, 1899.

PRINTED BY REQUEST OF THE SOCIETY.

E17
.K4

Unconscious Cerebration in History.

AN ADDRESS

READ BEFORE THE

Kansas Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

AT THE STATE HOUSE, TOPEKA, KANSAS, APRIL 19, 1899.

This paper was read before the Kansas Society of Sons of the American Revolution not without some doubts as to its reception, and hence the apology with which it opened and which is retained. The paper did not fail to meet with some criticism, but not altogether as expected. The greatest and almost only objection made has been that Gen. John A. Logan was given some credit for the abolition of slavery that more properly belonged to William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips and Charles Sumner. There is a shade of humor in this criticism. The failure to comprehend the thought of the writer is evident. Not a particle of approval of Logan's antebellum course was intended. His well defined record on the slavery question was thought to afford a pertinent illustration of "unconscious cerebration" in United States History. John A. Logan, in and out of Congress, and until some months after the breaking out of the civil war, had been a most subservient tool of the slave power. He was probably more responsible for the so called "Black Laws" of Illinois than any other one person. The extremists of the south had been give ample reason to believe that he was and would remain in sympathy with their cause. It

was supposed that he represented a very considerable northern element. He made no attempt to correct this impression until weeks and even months after such democratic leaders as Stanton and Douglas had declared their devotion to the Union

Very few are now ignorant of the fact that at the outbreak of the war Logan's sympathies were all with the south, and that it was only after the most persistent efforts on the part of Stephen A. Douglas, in which he exhausted argument and even threats that Logan was induced to declare for the Union. Even then room is left for a possible ungenerous suspicion. No one imagined the war would be so serious. It was predicted that it would be over in ninety days. Douglas was the great democrat of the state. Logan stood next in order of precedence. Douglas died June 3 unexpectedly. This left a vacancy in the United States Senate. What influence this had may not be known. But the Rubicon once crossed, Logan threw his whole soul into the Union cause. It was not his nature to do otherwise. He dazzled the army and the country by his dash and vigor, but, according to the evidence of the late C. A. Dana, in papers recently published, written while he was assistant secretary of war, and while with Grant at Vicksburg, Logan was greatly overrated if not as a fighter, certainly as a leader, in any such sense as Grant or Lee were leaders.

We admit having little admiration for the class of men to which Logan belonged. He had little of that devotion to principle that gave character to Wendell Phillips on the one extreme, and Wm. L. Yancey on the other. He was simply a machine politician and a machine soldier,—a gattling gun soldier if one chooses. But he had no such qualities as go to make the memory of Lincoln and Grant and Robert E. Lee a benediction to all, both north and south, who are willing to let the past rest in peace.

No merit is claimed for this paper. If there is anything of value herein, it appears in the effort to show that the struggle in which we are now engaged, was not sought by this nation, but that, once involved, any turning back would be cowardly, if not infamous. There are those who saw only virtue in the interference of this nation to prevent the extirpation of the Cuban people.

Some of these men are now lining up in history alongside the tories of the revolution and the blue light federalists of the second war with Great Britain. Instead of peace their influence has been to prolong the war. Many tories were good men; many blue light federalists were sincere and honest: many "Anti-Imperialist Leaguers" are now just as sincere. Perhaps they may yet come to see that they are just as mistaken now as their prototypes were in their days. They fail to tell how, or when, or where a halt could have been made. Humanity's call in the Philippines was as urgent as that in Cuba, and in both it is probably slight as compared with that which may soon come to us, unless Asia is saved from the ravishment of continental Europe. It at least seems possible that it may be the destiny of England and America to prevent this in the name of humanity. If this shall prove to be the result we shall find the subject of this paper illustrated anew, and again realize the truth of what our own "IRONQUILL" has expressed when he says:

"States like men,
Have destinies that take them—
That bear them on, not knowing why or how.

Office of
KIMBALL FAMILY NEWS,
Genealogical and Historical Monthly.
May 22, 1899.

G. F. KIMBALL.

KIMBALL PRINTING CO., NORTH TOPEKA, KANSAS.

"How often do events, as if by chance, come unexpectedly to pass, for which not one had even dared to hope."—*Terence.*

As the dimensions of the tree are not always regulated by the size of the seed, so the Consequences of things are not always proportionate to the apparent magnitude of those events that have produced them. Thus, the American Revolution, from which little was expected, produced much; but the French Revolution, from which much was expected, produced little.—*Colton.*

Mr. President and Gentlemen:

On this anniversary of the battle of Lexington, as well as that of the declaration of peace that followed the close of the seven years of war, naturally it might be expected that any address delivered before this Society would dwell largely upon the events pertaining to the opening days of the American Revolution. Certainly this would be most appropriate, but as there are others present who will do full justice to the anniversary occasion, I purpose leaving that field to them alone.

I have preferred to touch upon some other phases of more general history, cherishing a hope that possibly some profit may result in view of the existing condition of affairs in our own young, but history making country.

Permit me to add, however, at the very outset, that I do not feel absolutely secure in the position I have taken, or to be more definite, in some of the illustrations that I have attempted.

If, therefore, any apology were necessary for any portion of this paper, I prefer to make it at the beginning. I say this because I do not expect it to meet the approval of all. Then, it is possible, that by a stretch of the imagination, if one be so disposed, it may appear to trench upon the forbidden ground of both politics and religion. So I wish to aver at this time, that in any sense that reasonably can be contemplated by our constitution or rules, nothing of the kind is intended.

Really I have no thought that there can be any intent to debar allusion to either religion or politics, in the liberal use of these terms, in papers or discussion that may come before this society. In saying this much if I could have the least reference to dogmatic sectarianism, in the one case, or to partisan bigotry in the other, there could be no doubt of its being a violation of the spirit of this society. But such is not the case.

As a matter of fact religion, in some form is, and always has been, the handmaid of civilization. Yes, more, it is in fact the handmaid of barbarism the stage next lower than that of a crude civilization.

So, too, politics is in truth the handmaid of government, even in governments of low order, unless every person or subject is absolutely subservient to the will of one ruler. The higher the form of government the more of politics there must be in it, such real politics being the science of government itself.

Now do not imagine that I propose an essay upon these subjects, not even in the highest sense of the term. I have simply made this introduction in order, perhaps to disarm possible criticism.

I consider the Sons of the American Revolution as essentially and intensely a historical society. It may be that to some this simply means a sketch here, and a record there, of some man or some event in which one has a personal interest. To some it may mean only a record of battles fought and won, or fought and lost, of deeds of valor, of of chivalrous acts, of heroic ventures and marvelous escapes. Finally it may mean a record of military victory, a change of government, the birth of liberty.

Now all this is history, one phase of history, the most common phase of history. But it is not higher history. It is not a record of that subtile growth of humanity from a lower to a higher life that we call civilization, such as cannot easily be portrayed in words. It is surface or primary history. It is not the philosophy of history, which is about all there is to history beyond the quality it possesses of affording interest and amusement to the reader, and little if any real worth to the thorough student. There is more to history than mere romance.

A bit of canvas and a variety of pigments do not constitute a picture. The canvas may be finely wrought and the colors brilliant in their intensity, therefore interesting and attractive, but there is no artistic spirit seen until the artist has added his skill. So it is with historic canvas. The groundwork and the coloring must be such that great principles underlying national growth shall stand out to be seen and read in the ages yet to come. To write such history admits of no prevarication, no duplicity, no prejudice, but a devotion to truth, with the rare ability to analyze authorities and comprehend motives and purposes not always capable of explanation. There have not been many such writers of history.

It is said that an English lord once remarked to his son whose duty was to entertain his invalid father; "Read me no history. It is all, all false." The different lights in which historians portray the working out of events, and the part that man takes in that work, are often so contradictory that no one need wonder that men like this English noble are found to distrust all written history. Evidently the greatest task of the impartial historian is not the mere writing of facts, but the work of sifting the true from the false.

Some of the best writers have held that the historian ought only to state facts leaving the conclusions to be drawn from them to the student alone. If this were done oftener there would be less sifting to do on the part of later historians, and less of prejudice be engendered.

At a recent meeting of this association I took occasion, briefly to comment upon some features of American history as we have it—this surface history to which I have referred, and to comment upon the injustice done to some heroes of the American Revolution, and to enter complaint at the undeserved honors heaped upon some who were not heroes.

It was in this connection that our fellow associate, Mr. Scott, remarked, that, after all, it is not so material that just credit be given to the indidual, as to know that the principle involved in the issue has been gained. With this proposition we cheerfully agree.

It is a mooted question among historians, whether it is man who makes history or history that makes the man. I shall not attempt to discuss it in any way. In the philosophic sense man sinks into nothingness in either case. The man is nothing, the principle everything. But what is the principle, and why do we stop to deal with the individual? These are the questions I now wish to consider.

Whatever may be said as to the creation of history, I mean that living essence of progressive civilization—the individual is the instrument used, consciously or unconsciously, by God, Fate, Providence, or whatever term may be used todesignate that unseen and incomprehensible power that controls the universe, and directs the destinies of nations often times into channels least expected by the most astute, the most righteous, and supposedly the most inspired of men.

It this position is sound, it then *does* become, in reality, a matter of importance whether the individual, living or dead has the credit he deserves. The living man may be supposed to act under ordinary circumstances, up to his convictions of duty, and on a line parallel with his general intelligence, whether it be Nebuchadnezzar feeding upon grass. Simeon Stylites wasting thirty years upon a monument, or Tarquenado at the Inquisition. But whether honest of purpose, or not, the follies and errors of the dead are to be avoided as well as those of the living. The men from whom we expect heroic deeds have a right to believe that the honors they win will not be stolen by others. The dead are the models to which the living look as worthy to be copied, or as examples to be shunned. It *is* important, therefore, that we have a correct estimate of those who take an active part in the making of history, not entirely as a matter of justice to them, but for the benefit of the existing generation. The light of the past is the guiding star of most people, and if it be a false or distorted light it is not strange that many are led astray.

Now if there is anything to this point, I wish to illustrate it further by a few examples. At the meeting of this society above referred to I briefly mentioned the fact that nearly all our written histories, including our school histories, name Horatio Gates as the hero of the battle of Saratoga. I shall not enlarge upon this at this time further than to state in general terms, that Gen. Gates was really one of the most incompetent of our Revolutionary generals, and one always suffering from petty jealousies.

His unworthy ambition induced him to cruelly rob Gen. Schuyler of honors that belonged to him. No purer patriot than Phillip Schuyler is mentioned in American History. Whether as citizen, statesman, or soldier, his character was one to challenge admiration. The plans of the campaign to entrap Burgoyne were largely his. Gates had no part in them. Yet he was able to secure the appointment of ranking officer of the American army a short time before the battle and thereby to reap the fruits that rightfully belonged to others.

General Gates took no active part in the battle of Saratoga. If he did not sulk in his tent, he lounged there and left the fighting to his generals and soldiers. His jealousy of Arnold whose heroic qualities had displayed renewed vigor at Stillwater, had caused his relief from duty, and therefore he had no command when the battle began. But Arnold could not stand idly by and see the patriot army waver and give way for the want of leadership, and so as a volunteer he rushed to the rescue, and he and Daniel Morgan became the actual heroes of Saratoga.

The pusillanimity of Gates made him as willing to steal the honors of Arnold and Morgan on this occasion, as he had been to rob Schuyler of merits that were his.

Why, then, were the earlier writers of our history willing to pervert the truth that later historians have made clear? The answer is found in the simple fact that Benedict Arnold the traitor was the hero of Saratoga.

Our narrow, bigoted and sometimes over zealous historians of that day could never persuade themselves, after he became a traitor, to give Benedict Arnold credit for any good thing done before or afterwards. It was all the more aggravating for them to admit that Arnold won the battle of Saratoga holding no official command, because that was the turning of the tide—the decisive battle of the war. It was hard to admit that the traitor Arnold, had in all probability saved the cause of the revolutionary patriots.

But to disguise the truth is not the proper way to write history. It is not history at all. And yet, until within the last few years, at least, our revolutionary histories have been full of such conceits. Probably no one can be found, in the least degree, to apologize for the overwhelming error of Benedict Arnold. Nothing can palliate his crime of treason. But there is an old saying that the devil should have his due, and so should Benedict Arnold. He was one of the ablest generals of the revolution, and stood next to Gen. Greene in military capacity and in the confidence of Washington. If he was a traitor he is not the only one who would have betrayed the patriot cause. It is more than probable that Gates himself, under conditions similar to to those under which Arnold was placed, would have been no better. Certain it is that up to this period Arnold had shown greater devotion and had endured more sacrifices for the patriot cause than Gates.

Gen. Charles Lee was a more contemptible traitor than Arnold. His schemes to supplant Washington began almost as soon as the latter was appointed commander of the American forces. But the traitor General Lee had the skill to conceal his duplicity, and until recently, about all that was really known of his traitorous attempts we learn from the slight censure given him by Washington at Monmouth, and his temporary suspension from service. More recently letters from his own hand have come to light wherein he deliberately proposed to betray the American Army into the hands of General Howe and only a change of plans by the American generals prevented its consummation.

The actions of the Continental Congress were often incomprehensible, and no subsequent light has made them quite clear. The patience of Washington was often taxed. His greatness nowhere shows to better advantage than in his dealings with this erratic body. "Friends at Court" appear to have had remarkable influence. Gates was made by them. Gen. Schuyler was one of their victims. Arnold was another, but without the saving conditions that surrounded Schuyler. Despite his great record in Canada, at Herkimer and wherever a deadly conflict was on, Arnold was the victim of persecution and misrepresentation. He was aggravated to a needless degree by his enemies, and that he might have been influenced to some extent by his wife, who was in sympathy with the tories is altogether probable, but none of this can be urged in his defense. But General Charles Lee had no reason for his conduct, except a mean jealousy and desire to supplant Washington. The injustice done to Arnold was not allowed to die with him. Our prejudiced historical writers have always portrayed him in the most offensive light. As a child he is made to appear cruel, delighting in torturing insects and animals, playing truant at school, and growing up in ignorance. There is little foundation for all this. His childhood averaged well with that of other boys. His education was fair to say the least. He wrote and spoke well and had some knowledge of Latin. This much at least is due to Benedict Arnold. That he suffered mental

agony in after years is well known. His repentance was deep and sincere, as shown by the pains he took to educate his sons so that his name might to some extent be redeemed. And they lived to do him honor.

The name of another revolutionary hero I shall not fail to mention. His heroism was not like that of Arnold's before his treason, but it was as patriotic, and was never tarnished by treason nor cowardice. Yet this name is obscured in American History. It would not be easy omitting the names of Washington and Franklin, to say who did more for the revolutionary cause than Thomas Paine. And yet his name has been seldom mentioned by the writers of popular American History, and then as one to be treated with opprobrium. And all this because he was not a believer in the orthodox religion of that day and of this. Unfortunately much of American History, especially that of an early day was written by narrow sectarian preachers, who seemed to have held theories similar to those held by promoters of the inquisition, and so everything necessary must be distorted to serve their purpose. The truth was withheld where it did not line up with their ideas. If any thing seemed lacking to make a lively incident, some myth was invented like that of Parson Weems about Washington and his hatchet. Or Arnold must be made to torture dumb animals, or stories made up of Connecticut blue laws that prohibited a man from kissing his wife on Sundays. And many there are who believe these fictions and cherish them as interesting features of American history.

The revolutionary period developed many heroes and statesmen. They were by no means of one mind, but while Hamilton and Jefferson differed, no one dares question the patriotism and honest purpose of both. But the great democrat of the revolutionary period was not Jefferson, nor Madison, nor Franklin. Remember I do not use the name democrat in the modern party sense. The one person who had a clearer perception, of the rights of man, than any other of the early American patriots was probably Thomas Paine. Without any reference to his religious convictions, no man of that age foresaw so clearly the possible development of the democratic idea —the right of man to govern himself— as did Thomas Paine. The influence of no man of that age was more far reaching, or is more felt at this day, unconscious as we may be of the fact.

And yet the name of Paine does not figure conspicuously in our common histories. As intimated before, much of our history has been written simply to unveil what the writers desired to show and to conceal what they did not care to make known. If these same writers could have obscured the names of Jefferson and of Franklin, whose religious views were not greatly different from those of Paine, they would probably have shared the same fate. Fortunately for them and for the country, they both were many sided men. They both shone with marvelous brilliancy along too many lines of usefulness to permit their names to be obscured.

But enough in relation to individuals. So far we have dealt solely with what we termed surface history. We might compare this feature of history, and it is about all the average reader understands by the term, with our earthly body that exists only for a time, and then passes away. But as there is more to human life, as is generally understood, than the mere body, so there is a living spirit—a soul in history as in human life. We call it philosophy of history. It is the resultant effects of time and human effort. It is the birth and growth of

events without special relation to individual human effort. It is to this that I now call attention.

It would seem to matter little what the individual does, or whether his memory is preserved at all, so far as concerns results. Events seem to develop regardless of human agency, sometimes as contemplated, and often directly the opposite. The fact is that civilization has seldom been a product of premeditated design. This thought long ago found expression in the old adage that "Man proposes, but God disposes." A hurried glance into the past shows that civilization has steadily progressed westward, first finding a centre in one place then in another. One readily recalls Alexandria, Constantinople, Venice, Bruges, London. It will be noted that these have all been consecutively, the great centers of commerce. Civilization has followed lines of trade, for the obvious reason, that the wants of mankind, supplied only by trade, are the foundations of civilization. These wants consist of physical and mental necessities, which include also the spiritual needs of humanity. Trade meets these physical wants and religion in some form, the spiritual or mental.

In civilization where the imagination is the active mental element, this religion will naturally be fanciful. It appeals to the curiosity, to faith, to the love of the marvelous, to necromancy and even to the vagaries of the alchemist.

As the average mind grows stronger and more practical the religious or worshipful idea of mankind, grows stronger also, and becomes more or less based in intellectual thought.

But this is a line we have neither time nor disposition to follow further than it illustrates our subject. At the outset we said that religion is the handmaid of civilization, and that civilization is the event of history. Now this handmaid is often, as justice is portrayed, quite blind. In treating of the human brain the physician will discourse to us about "unconscious cerebration." The philosophical historian may, and indeed often does the same thing. Hence he is often compelled to notice how apt the plans of men are to miscarry. It is the unexpected that happens. We have made no distinction between the religious and the moral purpose that has most to do with advancing civilization. There are few men of prominence in the active work of life who do not claim to be actuated by a moral purpose. With a civilized people moral qualities go hand in hand with physical energies. One writer of political science has said that the predominance of a moral purpose in polities is always a portentous phenomenon under a constitutional government.

Now let us glance briefly at some examples of human development for the purpose of seeing how frequently the "best laid plans of mice and men gang aft aglee."

In one of his lectures on the growth of civilization, M. Guizot remarks on the revolutions that took place during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that if the men most active in producing them had been conscious of the results to follow their action, there would have been no such revolutions. Other historians have remarked to the same effect, so that to some degree it may be said that in history making the law of negative prevails. Let us cite a few examples. It will be necessary to refer mostly to nations older than our own. We have ourselves not made much history. We are too young. Probably we have made a good beginning and may afford a few youthful examples.

We begin by referring to the granting of Magna Charta. And right here we also strike one of the falsities of history. It is usually represented that

the Great Charter was granted as a concession to the people. This is the popular idea still, but is by no means the fact. If either King John or his barons could have foreseen results, there would have been at Runnymede, no demand for the charter by the barons on the one hand, and none granted by the king on the other. Neither party had any conception of events that were to follow. It affords a fine sample of unconscious cerebration in history. It was destined to weaken, and finally to practically destroy the prerogatives of both kings and barons.

Magna Charta was forced from John by his barons purely in their own interests. It was at the time a victory for the aristocracy. The people were mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. Neither king nor barons cared more for the people than for their cattle. The king was pressing the barons and they resented it. The barons rebelled. The people had no part in it. They were mere vassals, serfs to be bartered and sold with the lands they tilled if it was transferred. They were without representation in the government. It was a later king who rebelled against the encroaching power of the lords, who took advantage of the provisions found in the great charter which had lain dormant more than a hundred years, and called the people to his aid to suppress the movement of the barons to usurp the whole power of government. It was not till then that a parliament of the people was instituted. From that time on the power of both lords and kings began slowly to decline. And thus was England's greatest revolution an unpremeditated event. It was not only the greatest of English revolutions, but the greatest known to civilization.

It is by no means our purpose to discuss the general effect of the great religious Reformation of the sixteenth century. Certainly Martin Luther contemplated no such results as followed. Even if he had counted upon the building up of a religious hierachy in competition with that of Rome, he would have stood horrified at the thought that out of his reformation there would spring up widespread infidelity. And yet this was one result of the great reformation. There is little doubt today that the skepticism of France and of some other portions of continental Europe, may be traced to the reaction of the extreme teachings of many of the early protesting reformers. The simple fact has often been a matter of comment and regret among religious peoples. What may have been the influence of this skepticism upon civilization is not for us to say. Such results were surely far from those intended, but that they followed has been held by many learned thinkers. It has also been observed that this so called spirit of infidelity prevails largely among the most intellectual communities who claim the need of a more satisfying religious belief than is offered by any extreme sectarian creed, and that therefore more liberal and more rational forms of worship have grown up more in harmony with this enlightened age. We instance this as a historic feature neither to affirm nor to deny its truth. but only to illustrate another phase of the points herein made. But perhaps an instance of the kind under consideration, that has scarcely commanded a thought until quite recently, is one that promises to be the most remarkable in the world's history. This American nation of ours that has so startled the activities of all other nations within the last twelve months, and clearly bids fair to be the greatest civilizing and the grandest christianizing power the whole world has ever known, undoubtedly had its origin in the persecution of the English Puritan. It was the Puritan that gave spirit and virility to this nation. and the Puritan was driven

from his island home and forced to a new continent, to build up a new nation the destiny of which it is impossible to conceive. How little was suspected then that seeds were sown that would bring forth, in the early twentieth century, a christian power that would surpass that of the mother country and become the dominating civilizing influence of the earth?

We might here allude to an illustration with opposite results. Four centuries ago, Spain, the most powerful nation of Europe was a center of culture and refinement. It led in commerce and discoveries. Its naval and military power was the admiration as well as the dread of the world. Ferdinand and Isabella were among the most enlightened rulers of the age. Their statesmen were men of capacity and their purpose was to lay the foundations, after the union of Castile and Aragon, of a great and benificent kingdom. By no stretch of the imagination can it be held that the best Spanish intelligence of that age deliberately contemplated national suicide. Yet nothing could more surely have produced this result than the wholesale extirpation of the Jews and the banishment of the Moriscoes from the country. The one class represented the trade interests of the nation, and the other the skilled labor. It left the country without capital and without artisans. Had it not been for the vast wealth poured in by the new world the national decay would have been far more rapid.

To return now to our own national history. We have not much ripened fruit to show. We can hardly say that the pilgrim fathers would not have braved the dangers of the new world, if they could have been foreseen. They might have done so. They were made of that kind of material. There is more doubt perhaps in case of the settlers of Jamestown. In the case of our Revolutionary fathers there is also doubt. It seems marvelous now that they dared to rebel. They knew neither their own strength nor that of the mother country. From every rational standpoint the odds were against them. With justice on their side and their lives in their hands they went to battle for independence. What this really meant was ill understood when Paul Revere made his midnight ride to Lexington. It was imperfectly understood for a long time afterwards. It was simply a combination of circumstances that prevented Great Britain from bringing its full power against the rebellious colonies that enabled them to conquer. It is safe to say however that the Revolutionary fathers could have had no comprehension of what the United States would become in a century after the adoption of the constitution. If tney could not conceive the material advancement we were to make, no more could they imagine the new phases our civilization would assume before the opening of the twentieth century. What to do with the slavery system that had become fastened upon the colonies, was the great problem of the day. It continued for more than seventy years to overshadow every other question, and finally it brought into action a new party organization whose destiny was to effect its ultimate downfall. The growth of this party affords another example in American history of this unconscious cerebration to which we have alluded.

While there was a class of extreme abolitionists who were willing to go to any length in opposition to slavery, we believe it to be quite certain that if the organizers of the republican party could have foreseen in 1855, all that was to follow within ten year from that date, the party would simply never have been organized.

In this connection there occurs another thought along this line. As this whole question of slavery has long since passed into history, and is no longer a question of party politics, we assume that we may treat it as past history. We shall only aim to touch one incident as it bears upon the subtile development of events to which we have so far mostly confined this paper. The slave holding states themselves were foolhardy in rushing into the rebellion. Nor would they have done so but for false hopes that were held out to them by northern sympathizers with the slave system. Slavery was abolished by war, not directly, but incidentally. It is curious to note some facts in this connection. There were a few northern men of much prominence upon whom the rebellious states relied. One of these was Edwin M. Stanton who entered Buchanan's cabinet, and did more to save the union before the inauguration of Lincoln than any other one man. This was a blow to the southern cause, as severe as it was unexpected. Another was Stephen A. Douglas who promptly declared for the Union, but died when the war had hardly begun.

But there was one other character more in touch with the southern leaders than either of these. Today that name occupies a strange place in American history. Some two years ago there was unveiled in the city of Chicago, the largest equestrian statue in the United States. It was of a soldier who had won laurels on many a heroic field. Perhaps no other soldier had a firmer hold upon the hearts of the people at that time than John A. Logan. And that popularity he retained, especially with the veterans of the army until his death.

He had been a life-long aggressive supporter of the slave system. If the men who were working for the extension of slave territory, depended more upon any one northern sympathizer than another, that man was John A. Logan. They believed he had the power and they relied upon him to create a division in the north. Yet no one, with all his devotion to the slave power, did more, possibly no one did so much to overthrow it. Not any nor all the abolitionists of New England did more.

Garrison and Phillips and Sumner labored for a purpose. They sought a definite end, and that end was the abolition of slavery which was anchored in the constitution. It might have been reached in time. Not certainly during the present century by their methods.

Slavery was abolished by war. Logan's influence in abolition was the work of a two-edged sword. He was a leader, a representative, far more than either Stanton or Douglas, of a small class of northern men devoted to slavery, who by alluring promises led the slave states into rebellion. He introduced bills into the Illinois legislature and secured their passage that made any colored man in that free state but little better than a slave. His course in congress was of the same general character, so that the slave power, as it was called then, trusted him implicity.

It is not improbable that in those troublous days, during the closing weeks of Buchanan's administration, the war might have been averted, had northern men like Logan joined early with Stanton and Douglas in defense of the union. Southern hopes must have been checked at least. But great numbers hesitated, and among them Logan. His position was doubtless to him a trying one. As has been said his sympathies were, and always had been with the south. It is certain that at one time he contemplated raising a company in southern Illinois to aid in the rebellion. Later on he was led to

a change of mind. This was through the influence of Stephen A. Douglas, but it was not until the battle of Bull Run, nearly six months after the war had practically opened that the die was finally cast. From that time on Gen. Logan wielded his sword for the union cause with all the vigor he had before displayed in favor of slavery. In other words he fought valiantly to put down the rebellion, that all his influence previously had, unconsciously helped to bring about, and with that downfall followed the abolition of the slave system he had so vigorously upheld. With any partisan thought in mind the revival of themes like this and of so recent date would certainly be out of place before a society such as this. It is not easy to handle reminiscent subjects of this character even when they have passed into history. Partisan feelings cast their shadows a long way behind, but with a judgment sufficiently philosophical one may profit largely by delving into fields even recently tilled.

But little can we gain of immediate benefit from all that has so far been said unless we can learn the lesson we have intended to illustrate. If I correctly understand the underlying purpose of this society it is something more than to make a fad of the American Revolution. It, and other patriotic societies have more important work to do. We need not flatter ourselves that this age is very greatly different from those that have passed.

There have been changes in methods and an accelerated pace is manifest. There is clearly a difference in our civilization. The quality is higher. More has been granted to this age and more will be expected. An infinity of future lies before mankind. Democracy is in the ascendant but not yet triumphant. Religious liberty does not prevail. The rights of man are not recognized, not even among the most civilized and enlightened of nations. The world is still struggling in darkness, even though the light seems now and then to be breaking. The work of every historical society and every civilizing influence should lend its aid. All philanthropic and educational bodies desire the upbuilding of the human family.

The sincere purpose of all organizations that claim to seek the alleviation of mankind is not to be lightly questioned.

The greatest need of this age, as it has been of other ages, is a broader and higher intellectual light. "*Licht, licht, mere licht*," is said to have been the despairing cry of Goethe. Such has been the despairing cry of the ages.

If it is true that history teaches a lesson, how then are we to take it home to ourselves as a nation. Within the past year an epoch has opened in American history. One hundred years ago today the battle of Lexington was fought. It opened the fire of the American Revolution. Some thought it a mistake, a terrible calamity. Good men conscientiously opposed it. Philanthropists like Benjamin Thompson, afterwards Count Rumford, could not favor it. Bitter antagonisms grew up not only in American but in England, where strong elements favored the colonists. But these were mere incidents. They exist wherever conflicts exist. Opposing influences have been present in all our wars. Well meaning opposition. Good men, scholarly men, statesmen, senators, men in high places, are present examples. Their antagonism is not serious, but it is illustrative. The individual developments are the same now as ever. National developments change. The civilizing force moves onward. It is interesting as well as instructive to note its steps.

Reference has already been made to the Puritan movement That movement was the crystallization of what

may be called the Cromwellian idea. We want to dwell somewhat upon this point, for out of this Puritan movement have grown the most powerful civilizing forces the world has yet known and whose future is now but dimly realized.

Oliver Cromwell has no place in Westminister. His name never appears among the rulers of England: Even the old Puritan, both in England and America has largely dropped from the popular memory. Yet the Puritan influence has never been so powerful as today. Cromwellianism is doubtless the greatest embodiment of the Puritan idea. Up to his time there had been little segregation of Anglo Saxon power. There is no complete recognized segregation now. But it began to form about the Elizabethan era. It began by persecution and by disintegration. The broken and despised portions were forced off, or allowed to seek homes in a new and unknown land. They built up a new nation with high ideals, religious, political, social. As it grew into power and recognition its reflex influence was felt in the mother country. It was accelerated by the liberal thought that had been left behind. The American Revolution, not only gave liberty to the American colonies, bringing to them a new and vigorous growth, but it also served to broaden English thought. English liberty surely received a new impetus. Puritan influence had its effect upon the English church and is still at work. In the new America the same English church began gradually to have its effect upon the Puritan thought. And so the two nations, both christian, and both liberty loving, began to draw into close union. As great national powers they were both Anglo Saxon in character. United they were able to be the arbiters of the world.

The late Spanish war brought these two great powers together. We need not here go into the causes of this war. We prefer to deal with conditions as they appear at present and in the distant horizon.

There is much useless discussion in regard to national expansion. The very thought is trifling. The war is said to have been one of humanity because of the suffering of thousands of people in Cuba. There is something in this, a trifle only.

Apparently we have reached an epoch in the wold's history. As a people we are changing our national policy, not in regard to territorial expansion, for we have always done that as opportunity offered But we are lending our power and influence for the extension of civilization. In doing this we are but keeping step to the music of the ages. We are extending the field of christian influence. It is clearly not the studied thought of man. The christian recognizes in it the hand of God. Others will say it is the natural outgrowth of material conditions which unwittingly is equivalent to the christian idea. Others say "Manifest Destiny." Whatever it may be clearly our duty is to accept the situation which no power seems able to change and bravely meet the responsibilities as they arise. They will not be light. We shall need the highest degree of patriotism, the greatest wisdom and the wisest christianity and civilization. The very thought of religious and political liberty implies it. If territorial expansion follows as a necessary sequence, such necessity must have recognition, and instead of playing the part of a Jonah the American citizen must meet his duties as becomes men and heroes.

The flag of this western Anglo-Saxon nation has been chosen to lead a world wide christianizing movement, not yet within the comprehension of men. It is a duty handed down from Plymouth Rock. It is the more refined

and universal Cromwellian idea of christianity.

This flag is the symbol of advanced civilization. In peace it has been the symbol of commercial progress, of personal freedom and religious liberty. It is the symbol of National and personal energy, of refinement and cultivation, and modest worth.

In war it is the symbol of National power, determination and self reliance. In victory it is the symbol of a generosity and chivalry hitherto unknown among the nations of the earth. The American Flag is symbolic of more than all this. It is symbolic of a new National genius,—a genius as varied and novel in character as it is marvelous in strength. Something has been heard of the wonderful capacity of American mind before this. The world saw something of it during the war of the rebellion. It was regarded then, and since, as exceptional, spasmodic, ephemeral. Whatever the old world nations saw then of American characteristics they regarded as temporary or abnormal. The last year has brought new light to the world.

The old nations have cherished the idea that no government could be a war power without a large standing army. They have had an idea that any nation would be weak in diplomacy where no class existed that had not years of artful diplomatic experience. Our little war with Spain has set the world a wondering. It has set some of our own people a thinking. The ability of the Nation to meet these great emergencies we call our reserved power. But in what does it consist? Where does it lie dormant, year after year, until some great event brings it into action?

When the conditions are threatening we are wont to ask ourselves where are the men for the times. Where are our great statesmen, our diplomats, our admirals, our generals? The crisis comes on and then come the men to meet it. A seafaring man, generally unknown, sends out a report from Manila Bay that resounds throughout the world. Others destroy an entire fleet, in an hour or two at Santiago, where skill and daring did far more than Drake and Hawkins did against the same national enemy before the powers of the air stepped in to finish the destruction of the Armada. An unknown country lawyer is called to take the helm of State and proves himself the equal of any in skilled diplomacy. Another country lawyer from Ohio, comes up as another once did from Illinois, the first man in the nation, and with a firmness and sagacity not equalled since the days of Lincoln lays his hand upon the unsteady elements,—the jingoes of the Nation, and holds them in leash, until the time for action comes. It is human greatness, springing apparently from nowhere. It is the Anglo-Saxon type of Minerva springing fully armed from the head of Jove. And where is all this greatness, this reserved power, born and nurtured, and kept ready to appear at the Nation's call? We answer that it is bred and preserved in the greater average intelligence and education of the American people. Its foundation lies down in the christian sentiment of the Puritan descendants. It is born in our system of common schools. It is an outgrowth of our newspapers and magazines that go into every household and make every home in the land a forum for discussion of public affairs. From this substratum we build that broader education of the masses that marks a difference between this and other peoples. It is this higher and broader education of the masses, coupled with our system of self-government that gives the naturally superior minds of our people that alertness of perception that enables them to meet all conditions as they arise.

The old fogies of the old world and of

the new world talk of our traditions. It is an old world theory this worship of political traditions. The spirit of the American Nation has due regard for tradition and learns the lesson it has to teach. But it is not to be handicapped by usage and tradition. It meets conditions as they appear. If the American Indian will be civilized and christianized, we are ready and willing to do it. If not, he simply becomes exterminated. But we do not do it as Spain exterminated the Jews and the Moriscoes, the Caribbean Indians; the Aztecs, or the natives of Peru.

So we will be able to meet every demand in the regeneration of the Philippines. It is the call of humanity, of civilization, of Christianity. We are ready and able to meet this call. We declare this when we raise the American flag over new territory. The promise of the American flag is current throughout the earth today.

That promise may prove to be that 500,000,000 Asiatics shall not ruthlessly be torn asunder by grasping and greedy continental Europe. The Ameriflag planted in the Philippines supported by England means just this. It indicates peace, not war.

The great English nation has within the last twelve months come to realize all this as never before. This first branch of the Anglo-Saxon power has heretofore carried on its christian civilizing work alone. Heathen India and savage Africa have been brought to a higher plane. A century of unaided effort has been given to this work, while the American branch of the Anglo-Saxon race has been preparing itself for what now appears to be its great destiny.

During this century two notable movements have been going forward. While the United States has been dormant nearly all the continental European nations have been reaching out for portions of Asia and Africa. Wherever an opportunity offered some national octopus has sought to fasten its tentacles. It would be difficult to point out a case of this kind inspired by or accompanied with any sort of christian purpose. A thought of a better civilization has had little place in all these efforts. In the case of Spain its colonizing schemes, began much earlier, are too well known to need further reference.

The time has now come when no more really savage or so-called unoccupied or ungoverned country can be found. In consequence every considerable nation of continental Europe is today casting about for weaker nations to plunder, either in Africa or Asia. China seems to be the favorite victim of all. Thus we seem to approach the culmination of the first movement.

The second movement may be found in the gradual drawing together of the two Anglo-Saxon families. For more than a century there has been a decrease in national, political and sectarian antagonisms. The cavalier and the puritan have met and understand such other better. The royalist and the democrat are not so far apart. The churchman and the dissenter are more tolerant. Even the non-conformist has grown to be something of a ritualist. Even the great Wesleyan movement, an event that might in itself afford a chapter on unconscious cerebration in history, had its influence in modifying the English church.

And so there is today more of christian and national unity between England and America than ever before. If therefore we read history aright, there is more in this than has yet appeared on the surface. Not the war with Spain nor the present war with the Fillipinos, can be regarded as a war of humanity in the usual limited sense. Up to this time only preliminary steps have been taken. It is hoped that no more may be needed. At all events it is almost certain that the utter dis-

memberment of Asia by brute force, with no civilizing and christianizing purpose, will not be tolerated. The power to prevent this will be Anglo-Saxon, England and the United States combined.

The present condition of these eastern peoples is not popularly understood. There is not one, probably, that is not on a decline. Not one is really christianized—not one that has religious strength. Even the Moslem faith in Arabia and Turkey is without power to preserve and protect itself. Persia is liable to be overrun at any time. The inroads upon China by Russia, France, Italy and Germany have no significance beyond that of ruthless seizure and robbery.

The vast difference between the colonizing work of England and that of continental Europe must not be overlooked. English colonies are remarkably independent. They are civilized and christianized. Arts and industries are encouraged. Trade and manufactures follow. One can hardly recall a single colony of any continental nation that receives any such consideration, while the English colonies have always been more or less under humanitarian influences. Missionary and educational institutions, very different from those that followed the track of Spanish settlement have gone hand in hand with British colonization. Herein may be seen the impress of the Puritan. It may be said that trade and commerce and ambition have inspired British policy. Confessedly so to a great extent. But never as in the invariable case with Spain to the sacrifice of all humanitarian principle. The Anglo-Saxon is practical. It may be that the humane policy is the best political policy. Pity if it were not so. Better it certainly is than the Spanish policy of priestcraft, robbery and extermination. Better indeed than a more liberal colonial policy in which none but mercenary considerations enter.

The United States has not been a colonizing nation. Anglo-Saxon America has been more than one hundred years in training as a national athlete, seeking no combats, believing in human freedom, shirking no responsibility. No conflict with Spain was sought.

Abraham Lincoln spared no more effort to prevent war with the South, than President McKinley did with Spain. No other nation similarly situated would have done so much. No war with the Fillipinos was contemplated. It followed as an unavoidable incident. Altogether this whole Spanish affair affords another probable illustration of unconscious cerebration in history. We say probable illustration because final results are by no means in view. There is every indication that we are on the verge of tremendous events, the like of which the world has never known. We may have no belief in manifest destiny. We may be peace loving as we are. But no people has ever yet been able to resist the powers that be. The events of the past year could not have been avoided. We cannot escape the conditions of the present without opening the way for untold calamities. They must be met.

As there is no course for this nation to follow than that into which it has unconsciously drifted the duty of every American patriot seems clear. In view of all historic precedents and in the light of modern civilization, our individual and national duty would seem to be plain. There is no occasion for captious argument and faultfinding. What is just the wisest policy may not always be clear. But the hands of the government in what appears to be the wisest will be upheld by every clear-minded patriot. Responsibilities may be great. They have been great before, but in no emergency has the nation failed in its ability to meet them. It will not fail now.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 527 938 5